## Case 1:12-cr-00938-SHS Document 33 Filed 03/06/14 Page 1 of 38

E1G7WENS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 12 Cr. 938 (SHS) V. 5 XIA PING WEN, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 January 16, 2014 3:15 p.m. 9 10 Before: 11 HON. SIDNEY H. STEIN District Judge 12 13 APPEARANCES 14 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 15 Southern District of New York BY: REBECCA MERMELSTEIN Assistant United States Attorney 16 17 COLLEEN BRADY Attorney for Defendant 18 ALSO PRESENT: CHRISTOPHER DEGRAFF, F.B.I. 19 NANCY WU, Chinese Interpreter 20 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

2 (In open court)

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rebecca Mermelstein for the government. With me is Special Agent Chris Degraff.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. BRADY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Colleen Brady for Ms. Wen.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Swear the interpreter.

(Interpreter sworn)

THE INTERPRETER: My name is Nancy Wu, W-u. Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Wu. Please be seated. We're here for the sentencing of Ms. Wen. I have the following information. I have the presentence report prepared on August 9, 2010, along with the addendum approved on September 12 -- or, I'm sorry. Did I say 2010? August 9, 2013 -- along with the addendum approved on September 12, 2013, and the sentencing recommendation approved on the same day. In addition, I have a submission dated December 30, 2013 from Ms. Brady to the probation officer, and I have the memorandum in aid of sentencing on behalf of the defendant received in chambers on January 6th of this year, along with an extensive number of letters in support of the defendant. I read all of the letters and indeed all of this information, and I have considered all

E1G7WENS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also have the sentencing memorandum of the government filed on January 10.

Ms. Brady, is there any additional information I should have?

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, just for the court's information, I had not heard from Mr. Johnson, the probation officer, about my objections and clarifications, so I e-mailed him this morning, and he had never received the copy I mailed to him. I then e-mailed my objections and clarifications to him. He said he would make some of the recommendations but he was going to stand by his sentencing guidelines recommendation for sentence. He suggested that I ask the court for a short adjournment today, and I said I didn't think that was a wise idea given the logistics of everything. So, I just wanted to make the court aware of that conversation this morning.

THE COURT: Well, I gather what you have told me is that you faxed this, or sent in some way, this December 30 letter to the probation officer today.

MS. BRADY: I mailed it.

THE COURT: No, I understand, but he didn't receive it.

MS. BRADY: He didn't receive it.

THE COURT: What is it you are asking me to do, if anything?

MS. BRADY: He indicated that he was going to make

some of the adjustments.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, I can't adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report if you are going to tell me that the probation office is going to recommend that it be altered.

> Well, I guess --MS. BRADY:

THE COURT: What you can do now, if you wish, is raise any objections you wish to raise here, and I will deal with them here now, if that's what you want.

MS. BRADY: All right.

THE COURT: Let's go back to my original question. Was there any additional information I should have apart from the information that I identified?

> MS. BRADY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Government?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Ms. Brady, have you had a full opportunity to discuss all of this information with your client, and have you in fact discussed it all with your client?

MS. BRADY: I have, your Honor, at length and with an interpreter at each occasion.

THE COURT: All right. Now, what points do you wish to raise now in regard to the presentence report, if any?

MS. BRADY: In part A of the PSR, paragraph 2, Ms. Wen coached asylum applicants by way of providing questions that typically would be asked during their asylum hearings.

example of these questions on the topic of family planning is attached as Exhibit A. I also included it in my sentencing submission to the court.

On paragraph 12 --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. What would you like me to do?
What are you asking the court to do in regard to that paragraph
2?

MS. BRADY: I'm asking to substitute my language for the one that's in the current report.

THE COURT: Well, those are two different things. The way it now reads it says that she coached other people to lie during interviews. And what you have says that she provided questions that would typically be asked. I take it the latter is your position as to what happened.

Government, do you have a position on that?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Yes, your Honor. I think the PSR should remain as it is. That's the language from the indictment that the defendant pled guilty to, but notably I'm not sure that coaching an asylum applicant on what to expect in an asylum interview would even be a crime. The crime is that she prepared them to lie in their interviews by helping them to prepare for how to provide answers that were not true. So, I think --

THE COURT: Well, I have some question based on the allocution which was taken before Magistrate Judge Gorenstein

and which I have adopted. It wasn't entirely a hundred percent clear as to what she was allocuting to. I'm quite comfortable that the allocution covered the elements of the crime, and it was appropriately sent to me on recommendation by Judge Gorenstein, and it was appropriately adopted, but I do have some questions as to exactly what she did.

You are saying that she gave -- proposed false answers to interviewee applicants during interviews?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Not during the interviews, your Honor. Applicants would sort of memorize the fake story that they were going to present to the asylum officer. This defendant would meet with applicants in advance of their interview and would essentially practice with them for the lies they were going to tell.

THE COURT: And your position is she knew they were false stories.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Of course.

THE COURT: Ms. Brady?

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, I think the court's point about the allocution is what is important. It did make out the elements of the offense, and she never allocuted to falsely translating; it was rather that she was coaching them.

THE COURT: Did she know they were false stories?

MS. BRADY: I believe that the allocution indicates that she did believe they were false or at least thought they

1 may be false.

THE COURT: No, I think -- well, you tell me, but I think she allocuted to knowing that they were false stories.

MS. BRADY: I think that's right, your Honor, without looking through the transcript.

THE COURT: Well, your proposed paragraph 2 is very different than paragraph 2 there. Why don't I alter paragraph 2 to say, "It was a part and object of the conspiracy that Wen and others coached asylum applicants to give false stories during interviews." Ms. Brady?

MS. BRADY: I am happy with that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report with the following changes. The first one is paragraph 2 strike "lie" and put in place "false stories". What else?

MS. BRADY: On paragraph 12, your Honor, my clarification would be Ms. Wen did not create the asylum application but rather provided the asylum applicants questions that would be asked during their asylum hearing.

THE COURT: Government?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Your Honor, paragraph 12 describes the scheme generally, not just the conduct of this defendant. It's not the government's position that this defendant created the false application herself, but I think that paragraph 12 accurately describes the conduct that was involved.

1 THE COURT: Yes, I think that's right, because it says "and her coconspirators". 2 3 MS. BRADY: I am happy with that, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: I'm going to keep 12 the way it is. Next. 5 Paragraph 20, Ms. Wen never falsely MS. BRADY: 6 translated. 7 THE COURT: Do you intend to go through every one of 8 your paragraphs here on this December 30 letter? 9 MS. BRADY: I think so, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 MS. BRADY: And I apologize. 12 THE COURT: Let me look at paragraph 20. 13 Well, this issue is whether or not when she was 14 translating during the interviews a person said X and she 15 translated it as non X. That's the issue. 16 MS. BRADY: That's my understanding. 17 THE COURT: And your position is that she did not do 18 that. 19 MS. BRADY: That's correct. 20 THE COURT: Your position is that if the person said 21 X, even if it was unfavorable, she translated it as X. Is that 2.2 correct?

MS. BRADY: Yes.

23

24

25

THE COURT: But you refer to the allocution.

Government, what's the government's position?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Your Honor, we are still in the section governing the scheme generally. It's describing the work of people who did the translating work in the scheme generally.

The allegations against this defendant are actually not that she translated in the interviews but that she prepared people for the interviews. So, it's not the government's view that she is even being described by this paragraph. It's not the government's view that she falsely translated answers since she wasn't translating in the interviews.

THE COURT: She did not translate in the interviews?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: She prepared people for the interviews. She did not accompany them to the interviews to translate for them. So this description --

THE COURT: I did not realize that. All right. Why don't I simply add to paragraph 20 that the defendant did not provide translation services during the interviews.

## Government?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No objection.

MS. BRADY: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will add that to paragraph 20.

21?

MS. BRADY: Paragraph 21, Ms. Wen was not paid by law firms or employed by law firms but, rather, she was a

self-employed translator and was paid by her clients, not the law firms. Ms. Wen sold one false one-year letter.

THE COURT: Well, I saw that she allocuted to selling one false one-year letter.

MS. BRADY: Correct.

THE COURT: Government, what's your position on who she worked for?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No objection, your Honor. The government agrees that she was a self-employed contractor.

I don't want to interrupt you, but I am happy to jump ahead to the next one, too.

of paragraph 21 I will put "Ms. Wen was a self-employed translator and was paid by her clients, not a law firm. And Ms. Wen sold one false one-year letter." Is that the position of the government, that there was only one false one-year letter?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: It is not, your Honor. The government's cooperating witness in this case who purchased the one-year letter that the defendant allocuted to approached the defendant to do so because the witness was already aware that the defendant had sold these letters in the past.

It's true that the defendant didn't allocute to the other letters in her allocution, and it certainly wasn't necessary as part of her allocution, but the government does

not believe it was only one. I don't think we need to have a 1 Fatico on the matter. I don't think it affects the 2 3 government's view of the appropriate sentence in any event. 4 THE COURT: I understand. I'm going to change 5 paragraph 21 to the following: "Ms. Wen was a self-employed 6 translator and was paid by her clients and not a law firm. Ms. 7 Wen allocuted to selling one false one-year letter; the position of the government is that she sold additional false 8 9 one-year letters." 10 All right. Ms. Brady? 11 MS. BRADY: That's fine, your Honor. On paragraph 41 12 it's a typo. "Wen said that she wasn't happy there because her 13 step grandmother never had any biological children of her own." 14 Any being --THE COURT: Oh, right. Paragraph 41 the word "ay" is 15 being changed to "any". 16 17 MS. BRADY: Correct. 18 THE COURT: Next. 19 MS. BRADY: Paragraph --20 THE COURT: Let me look. I see 49. One moment. 21 In paragraph 49, in the third line, the word Wang, 22 W-a-n-g, should be changed to Yang, Y-a-n-g. 23 On paragraph 50 does the government have any reason to 24 doubt the new figure that the defendant is proposing, that is,

25

8800 rather than 8000?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: We do not. And I should note we have no objections to the remainder of the factual corrections.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Paragraph 50, I'm going to change the amount 8000 to the amount 8800.

Paragraph 51, I'm going to change to "Ms. Wen was never married to her biological son's father. She married Ming Zheng Zeng January 1996, and the couple divorced in 2002."

Paragraph 54, change the name Dr. Lawrence Quan to Dr. Nicholas Guan.

The last sentence, add the words at the end of that sentence "and daily life".

Paragraph 55, the first line, change the single word "a psychiatrist" to the plural "psychiatrists". And in the last line where it says Mount Sinai Hospital add the phrase "in 2003".

Paragraph 58, change 1994 to 1996.

Paragraph 61, in paragraph 61 change the second sentence to read as follows: "She worked as a translator for individuals who were applying for various benefits, such as housing, Social Security, medical and immigration status, including some asylum applications, and earned approximately \$1800 per month." That's the change in sentence two at paragraph 61.

Change paragraph 63 to read as follows: "Ms. Wen

presently has no bank accounts. She has an IRA account and other investments worth approximately \$60,000. As much as she can, Ms. Wen provides financial support to her parents who are elderly and have health issues.

All right. I adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report with those specific changes. I will return all of this information to the probation department. That helps with some of my questions, but let me get a better fix on exactly what this defendant did.

All right. I think I have it. Looking at my notes and hearing what the parties have said, what she would do is she was given the stories, and she knew them to be false but helped the people prepare for their interviews with the Department of Homeland Security and helped them provide answers that were consistent with what she knew to be a false story. Essentially is that the government's position?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Two clarifications, I suppose. The interview is actually with the Office of Citizenship and Immigration Services, not the Department of Homeland Security.

THE COURT: That's a subdivision of the Department of Homeland Security. Go ahead.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: This defendant is right that she had her own company. That company is what is known in sort of colloquial terms as a travel company. So, she wasn't just given someone's story and helping them prepare. Clients would

come to her as their first stop in seeking asylum, and she 1 would help them with all of the paperwork, and indeed she would 2 3 then find the lawyer who would actually be the one signing the 4 application. So, I think her sentencing submission tries to --5 THE COURT: She would find the lawyer who what? 6 MS. MERMELSTEIN: Who would then submit the asylum 7 application. So the asylum application has a certification from the lawyer on the front. The clients came first to this 8 9 defendant, and then this defendant, having helped them prepare 10 all the paperwork, helped them find the lawyer to make the 11 submission on their behalf. 12 THE COURT: So at what point was the false story 13 devised? 14 MS. MERMELSTEIN: It was written by others working 15 with the defendant in the travel company. 16 THE COURT: In her company? 17 MS. MERMELSTEIN: Correct. 18 THE COURT: So, is it the government's position 19 that -- and she owned this company? 20 MS. MERMELSTEIN: That's correct. 21 THE COURT: So that it was her company, others in her 22 company who developed the false story? 23 MS. MERMELSTEIN: That is the government's position, 24 yes. 25 Ms. Brady, what is the defense's position? THE COURT:

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, that is not my understanding of what happened. Ms. Wen did employ certain paralegals, and they assisted with this questioning process and coaching process but did not prepare the stories. However, in some instances other successful asylum applications were provided to the new incoming applicants as examples of what one could say. Does that make sense?

THE COURT: In other words, here, this was a successful story, you know what to do with it. Right?

MS. BRADY: Well, maybe not that directly, but this is a successful story, you have to prepare your own story.

THE COURT: Well, that does put a different light on it. I thought really she was just a hired translator.

MS. BRADY: I mean that was not in every instance, your Honor.

THE COURT: It doesn't have to be.

MS. BRADY: No.

THE COURT: Let me look at a few things in the allocution.

MS. BRADY: Sure.

THE COURT: What's the position of the defense on the false one-year letter? As I understand it, based on these papers, to be successful in an asylum application you have to have been in the United States for less than one year. And she was paid \$500 to sign somebody else's name to a false one-year

letter that was given to her that she knew to be false? In other words, the letter said I know Mr. X, and I know that he has been in the United States for less than one year because A, B, C. And she was given this letter she says by the government agent -- I take it that's the cooperating witness --

MS. BRADY: Correct.

THE COURT: And she knew it was false. Presumably she knew who Mr. X was and that he has been in the United States for more than one year. But she accepted \$500 and signed it not Xia Ping Wen but with somebody else's name. Is that what happened?

MS. BRADY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does your client agree with that?

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, essentially that is correct, and she does admit to that.

THE COURT: All right. All right. I think I have a better sense of what this defendant did. I want to hear from the defense attorney as to whatever you want to tell me; then I want to hear from the government; then I will hear from the defendant herself.

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, I will rely on my submission but briefly just highlight a few points.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BRADY: Ms. Wen, as the court knows, is 50 years old; she has no criminal history whatsoever.

THE COURT: None whatsoever.

MS. BRADY: None. And I believe that her statement in the sentencing submission, and my experience with her over these several months, I believe her remorse is significant and genuine.

THE COURT: I think it is also based on certainly these letters. She certainly has extensive community support as well from a wide range of people.

MS. BRADY: And I'm asking the court to impose a sentence of probation. And my major concerns are that if she were to be sent to jail she would be not only missing out on her psychiatric counseling and treatment — which she goes to weekly, and she takes several medications — but that simply would not happen in the best of facilities in BOP.

The other concern is that she does have this \$8800 that she needs to contribute to her son's tuition and incidental expenses while he is at Cornell. He is here in the courtroom because he is on holiday break right now.

THE COURT: Welcome. He is quite a success story, and that shows that she is a good mother — a very good mother, apparently — and her son seems to be quite successful in American society. That's all to the good. And it's important, young man, that you stay in school, finish. I am sure you realize that. Go ahead.

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, I guess the last point that I

did make in both the objections to the PSR and also in my sentencing submission, is I find it very difficult to reconcile the fact that the same probation is recommending different things for different defendants with the same offense level.

In the John Wang case --

THE COURT: Well, because one presumes the history and circumstances of the individual and the crime are different.

And, indeed, 18 U.S.C. 3553 mandates that the court take into account the history and characteristics of the crime and the individual, along with all the other factors in 18 U.S.C.

3553(a).

I saw that you pointed out two people that Judge Patterson had sentenced to probation, and he also has sentenced people to incarceration. What are you telling me about the people he sentenced? I am not so much concerned about the exact same crime, although obviously that's important, but we need to know the circumstances of that crime and of the individual, that individual's criminal record, if any, and again all of the factors in 3553(a).

MS. BRADY: My understanding, your Honor, is that the four defendants in the John Wang case, the probation office recommended probation, and in at least two of those defendants their offense level was the same as Ms. Wen's, 14.

THE COURT: Yes. But actually what you have just done is distinguish those individuals from this individual, because

you have said that the probation department there recommended probation, and the probation department here, I believe -- I can check -- agrees with the government's recommendation.

MS. BRADY: That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So you have actually now distinguished this case from that case.

MS. BRADY: I take that point, your Honor, but I believe that no translator has been sentenced to incarceratory time.

THE COURT: She seems to be more than a translator. thought she was a translator, but at least according to the government now this seemed to be a full service operation which she owned, and she had paralegals working under her. have seen a number of cases on East Broadway where people would literally come into the office, and the heads of the office would have file drawers with different stories, one that they belonged to a house church and were persecuted, and the subsection of that was that they were followers of Falun Gong and were persecuted for that, hounded, and had a risk of persecution. Another set said that they had been forced to have an abortion. And another set of proposed stories said that they were being persecuted for their political opposition to the Chinese regime. And the people are supposed to choose one or the other and memorize them. It sounds like she is closer to that than to being a simple translator.

1 Certainly if she owned the place, and if the 2 paralegals are supplying these proposed stories --3 MS. BRADY: Your Honor, may I --4 THE COURT: -- that's different from being a 5 translator. Go ahead, take your time. 6 MS. BRADY: Ms. Wen employed one full-time and one 7 part-time paralegal at any given time. I mean that was the extent of the operation. 8 9 THE COURT: And did the one full-time and one 10 part-time paralegal have scripts that they would provide to 11 these people? 12 MS. BRADY: Your Honor, it is my understanding that 13 there are actually translators that were working for Ms. Wen 14 and that they would translate but also provide these questions. 15 THE COURT: I'm saying this as a declarative statement 16 but I'm asking it as a question really. Not questions that 17 were going to be asked based on the true history of the 18 applicant but, rather, a story for the applicant to tell that the defendant knew was false. Is that right? 19 20 MS. BRADY: Yes. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 22 Is there anything else you wanted to say? 23 MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor. 24 MS. BRADY: Your Honor, as I say, I believe that the 25 cases that the government cited for incarceration time were all

1 lawvers. There was one non-lawyer. THE COURT: Also, in my experience, normally the heads 2 3 of these mills are attorneys --4 MS. BRADY: Correct. 5 THE COURT: -- and to that extent, you know, their 6 punishment should be appropriate. 7 They are held to a higher standard, yes. MS. BRADY: 8 THE COURT: That's a better way of phrasing it. 9 MS. BRADY: No, your Honor, I would rely on our 10 submission. 11 THE COURT: Government, things are changing here. 12 What's the position of the government? 13 MS. MERMELSTEIN: Your Honor, the government feels 14 strongly that a guideline sentence is appropriate in this case. 15 To make one --THE COURT: No, I think a guideline sentence is too 16 17 That's my current thinking. The issue in my mind is 18 whether incarceration is appropriate or not. But I didn't mean 19 to cut you off. 20 MS. MERMELSTEIN: That's fine, your Honor. 21 First, I think it's actually -- based on the span of 22 cases that were all part of the same take-down in this case, 23 that as your Honor knows are before multiple judges -- it's not

the case that the person running the mills is sort of typically

In many of the cases the person running the mill is

24

25

not a lawyer, and they are either paying to use the name of a real lawyer, or they are sort of employing a real lawyer for the need for the bar ID number.

THE COURT: But is that the level that this defendant is at?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, we're not suggesting that she is equal to the people who are running sort of huge mills, but I think she has also mischaracterized the level of her involvement. And although I don't in any way doubt that she is very sorry now, in her letter to the court she talks about how she can easily be tricked and misled, and that sort of it was out of a desire only to be helpful to people, and I think that's not accurate. This wasn't sort of an inadvertent mistake into which the defendant fell where she ended up helping someone. This was a routine part of the business and a way to make money.

And this wasn't sort of a secretive business. It's no great news to anyone involved here that there is massive asylum fraud and it unfortunately can be relatively easy to accomplish with certain stories through people who have in fact had these experiences and have relayed them have a ring of truth. So, I think the defendant's characterization of her role and her culpability is really minimizing what her responsibility was here, because she was the person to whom these applicants were coming.

So, first, I think the nature of her own involvement --

THE COURT: I had thought she was hired by a law firm to be a translator.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: The opposite in fact.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: So, second of all, to talk briefly -- although I don't think this seemed to be a point that was of great interest to your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say that again.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Just to address briefly Judge

Patterson's sentences -- although your Honor seemed to

recognize that all defendants are different and it's hard to

compare apples and oranges -- but first I should say that the

government felt strongly that those probationary sentences were

not sufficient. Obviously, Judge Patterson disagreed.

But I think that what can be seen in all of these related cases that are now pending is that asylum fraud is just a huge problem. It is much too easy for people to come in and take advantage of the stories that have the ring of truth and to bog down the system, to force asylum officers to make judgment calls about who is lying. And there has to be some general deterrence here, I think more than in some other cases. Where everyone knows drugs are illegal, I don't think it's any great surprise that if you sell large quantities of drugs, you

might go to jail. But here there is almost a cavalier attitude about the lies and about the fact that there is sort of no victim of asylum fraud.

THE COURT: You mean in the case of this defendant you think she is being cavalier?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I don't think this defendant is being cavalier. I am saying that looking at the way in which these kinds of mills operate, that applicant after applicant after applicant is being told here is one that worked, you draft it, you come back, no, no, here is some details that would be better, that there is not a sufficient recognition of the cost to the system, of the cost to the idea of asylum, the idea to the actual people who are eligible for asylum. So I think in this case, as in all of these cases, there is a real need for general deterrence, there is a real need to send a message.

THE COURT: I agree with you, I don't think this is an issue of individual deterrence; I don't think this defendant will ever do this again. The issue is general deterrence, I agree with that. But how to effectuate that goal is what we're talking about, as well as punishment. Go ahead.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, I think your Honor is exactly right, that's the question. And I think probationary terms don't accomplish that. I think that the message that has been received, that we're seeing as other defendants communicate

with the government about cases that are still pending, is that the probationary term is not a deterrent, it's not seen as being taken seriously as a serious crime, and I don't think it will serve as a deterrent.

This is a case -- not this defendant's case in particular -- but the take-down by the government of these cases has received some real press attention in the Mandarin language newspapers in New York.

THE COURT: Well, several of the letters say that the letter writer was scanning the Internet and was surprised to see that this defendant was involved because they never imagined she would be involved in it. Doesn't that go to general deterrence?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I don't think so, your Honor. I don't think it's sufficient that people learn that somebody who did it has been arrested. There has to be a significant punishment. There has to be a punishment that says that the government takes this seriously, and that it is a serious crime, that it's not going to be treated as sort of a minor transgression. So, I think an incarceratory term is absolutely necessary.

And it's been clear in the government's dealings with other defendants that the general view of the probationary terms has been that that's sort of the big win and that they can sort of move on without thinking about it. And I think

that's a big problem because there are massive, massive numbers of asylum applications. There are thousands and thousands of applications filed every year in New York alone, and I think this is really representative of sort of how prevalent the fraud is.

asylum officers in that first round interview in large part because they are deemed to be fraudulent. There are also cases where someone is honest about a fact that makes them ineligible are for asylum, but vastly more because of fraud. This is a massive problem, and the need for the word to be out that it cannot continue is really significant.

In addition, I think this defendant, because of the nature of her involvement, I think the just punishment includes an incarceratory term. So, I don't want to belabor the point, but I think for those reasons a guideline sentence is appropriate.

THE COURT: Well, you mentioned several times the other cases in what you characterize the as the take-down. I am not sure I am aware of what other cases there are in what you call the take-down, so talk to me. Is the government going after the lawyers who are the heads of these things, or the owners who are not lawyers of massive mills? There is no indication here that this was a massive mill. I mean it is illegal, but it doesn't sound like a massive operation. So,

what is involved in what you have said are other cases?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: There are a number of cases pending before Judge Patterson. There is a case scheduled for trial on February 3 before Judge Marrero of an attorney, his name is Ken Giles. I don't know that I can get all the indictment numbers matched correctly, but I believe that's 12 Cr. 935. There is a nine defendant case going to trial before Judge Abrams in March. That is a significant mill not run by lawyers, although lawyers were connected to and employed by the firms in order to enable the work. That particular case, those are two related mills.

In any event, the government arrested 30 defendants as a result of a wide-spanning asylum fraud investigation at multiple different firms, and because it wasn't one conspiracy, just the same sort of crime, those people were charged in multiple indictments.

THE COURT: Those people were charged --

MS. MERMELSTEIN: -- in multiple indictments. It's not the government's contention that this defendant was at the top of one of the biggest mills. Those people are facing guidelines, for example, in the range of 70 months. So she is not situated like them, as I think the plea agreement indicates, and that's not the government's position. But it's also not the government's view that she is at the bottom.

THE COURT: How did you come up with 25 to 99

documents?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I apologize, your Honor. One moment. The government's evidence indicated how many total asylum applications this defendant was involved in submitting, and in assessing what evidence would prove sort of how many of those were clearly fraudulent, that was the government's view of what it could prove at trial.

THE COURT: Talk to me about the two defendants -- if you know who they are -- referenced by Ms. Brady.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: The defendants before Judge Patterson?

THE COURT: Yes, that's who she referenced. And she references them in her defense submission as well.

MS. MERMELSTEIN: I apologize, your Honor. Obviously there are multiple AUSAs on the multiple cases, but my understanding of those defendants is that they were paralegal — Liana Chen was an interpreter, and the other two were paralegals, and the fourth was a lawyer. Judge Patterson I recall in at least one of those sentencings placed great weight it appeared on the relative unsophistication of the defendant as a person. The defendant had an elementary school education, I think did not read or write in any language, and Judge Patterson opined that he thought it was possible that there had been some misunderstanding that drove things, notwithstanding obviously that the defendant was legally

guilty. But it wasn't the full scope of intent that you might expect, and his relative unsophistication, his lack of English language abilities, might have led to his participation in the crime.

I can't sort of standing here give you all the details of all of the defendants, but I think that they are not wildly dissimilarly situated from this defendant. This defendant I think had employees of her own; she was the first stop for people. I think she is fairly characterized as being more culpable than them. But I also think that, you know, there are more culpable defendants than her. She is sort of roughly in the middle, I would say.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Wen, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure give you the right to address me. You don't have to say anything. You have the right not to say anything. But if you want to address me, as I say, you certainly have the right. Now is the time if you want to tell me anything.

THE DEFENDANT: Honorable Judge, I believe you have read my statement submitted to you, and I am deeply apologetic and very sorry for my words and my behavior.

During this year after I have been arrested, I have suffered both psychologically and physically, and I have paid a great price myself.

I'm a 50 year old woman who should not have ended up

in this situation. Especially I should not have let my son see me in this type of situation. If I had known back then this is what would happen, absolutely I would not make this choice, I would not do this.

After I reflected on myself, and I took time to reflect and think of my own mistake, I feel deeply sorry and repent for my mistake, and I plead for your Honor's leniency.

I promise I will be a better person. I have confidence in myself because I know deep down I'm a good person. I have the ability to criticize myself and to correct myself.

I did not know what I have done was so wrong before, and I have confidence in my friends and relatives. I do believe they will continue to support me, to make me to be a better person, and to correct me if I make mistakes, to turn a bad thing into something beneficial.

If your Honor and the government are willing to give me an opportunity to forgive me, I'm willing to spend the rest of my life to do good deeds, to serve the community and to serve society.

I want to point out one fact. At the time I pleaded guilty to the amount of documents that were submitted for application, the number 25 to 99 is the total number during the entire five years I helped those people submit it, and I do not know how many of those were fraudulent.

So, I want to make my apology to your Honor and to the government one more time.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. I didn't mean to cut you off, Ms. Wen. If you have anything more to say, you can; but I assumed you were finished.

THE DEFENDANT: No more. So help me God.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. I want to look something up.

Ms. Wen, I do believe that you are extremely remorseful. I believe you regret very much what you did. You have a tremendous community support, as set forth in these letters and by the fact that so many people are here today to support you. You can rely on that in the future. You obviously devoted a great deal of attention and effort to raising a son who seems to be very successful. All of that is to the good.

I am concerned, however, about what is known as general deterrence. I don't think that individual deterrence is a substantial issue in this sentencing, because I don't think you ever are going to commit this crime again, but general deterrence is very important, especially in the area of immigration fraud.

You knew the stories were false. You have allocuted to that. You were not simply a translator who translated documents, and you played a not insignificant role in

conspiring to commit immigration fraud.

In part for punishment but also in large part for general deterrence — so that others know not to follow in the path you have followed — I do believe some incarceration is appropriate. I am not going to sentence you to the guideline range, because I think that is too high, especially given the apparent uncertainty of the number of documents that were false and that you knew was false, because there is a technical point that there is an increase of six levels due to the allocution to 25 to 99 documents. The levels fall off if the documents were fewer. And I also don't think the bottom of the guideline of 15 months is appropriate. I think it's greater than necessary to meet the ends of the criminal justice system. But it is also appropriate that there be some incarceration here.

My intention is to sentence you to three months' incarceration, to be followed by one year of supervised release, with the conditions set forth in the probation department report; and I will set those forth in a minute. And I do believe that that is an appropriate sentence.

I will hear argument from both sides, but my current intention is not to require you to be remanded now, and that you will be able to surrender at a later point. That's my intention.

Are there any formal objections by the defense or by the government before I formally impose sentence?

MS. BRADY: No, your Honor. And I was intending to -- excuse me, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. BRADY: Your Honor, I had intended to ask the court if you were going to impose an incarceratory sentence, to let her surrender at a later date.

THE COURT: That's my intention. As I said, I will hear argument. The government may have a position after. Do you?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: Your Honor, we have no objection to sentence and no objection to your Honor setting a surrender date.

THE COURT: OK, no legal objection has been set forth by either side. I now will impose sentence.

I hereby find that the offense level is 14, the Criminal History Category is I. The guideline range is 15 to 21 months.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this court that the defendant Xia Ping Wen is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of three months.

Upon release from imprisonment, Ms. Wen shall be placed on supervised release for a term of one year, with the conditions recommended by the probation department, namely the following mandatory conditions: Ms. Wen shall not commit

another federal, state or local crime; she shall not illegally possess a controlled substance; she shall not possess a firearm or dangerous weapon or destructive device; she shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. I hereby find that Ms. Wen is highly unlikely to abuse drugs or any controlled substance and, therefore, I am waiving the mandatory drug testing requirement.

Ms. Wen shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by a probation officer. During the period of one year of supervised release she shall comply with standard conditions 1 through 13, plus the following special conditions: She shall participate in a mental health program approved by the probation office; she shall continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by her healthcare provider; she shall contribute to the costs of services rendered not covered by third-party payment, based on her ability to pay and the availability of third-party payment. I hereby authorize the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports to the relevant healthcare providers.

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of Bureau of Prisons, Ms. Wen shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which she is released. I am not imposing a fine because I find Ms. Wen lacks the ability to pay a fine, after taking into account the presentence report and

her lack of assets, her modest income and her family's responsibilities. I am also not imposing restitution, because I find that there is no victim within the parameters of 18 U.S.C. 3663.

I hereby order Ms. Wen to pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100, which is due immediately.

I have sentenced the defendant with all of the factors in 18 United States Code, Section 3553 in mind. I have sentenced her below the guideline range. I understand my authority under the Booker and Fanfan cases, and I believe the sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the ends of the criminal justice system.

The reasons why I have varied below the guideline range under Booker and Fanfan is primarily because I believe the defendant is genuinely remorseful, I believe there is essentially no risk of recidivism, and because of the wide range and deep community support shown on behalf of this defendant.

Ms. Wen shall surrender to the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons on or before 2 p.m. on February 28, 2014.

MS. BRADY: Is there any way we could have another month, your Honor?

THE COURT: Just a moment. Is the government seeking forfeiture? I take it not.

1 MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor. THE COURT: All right. The reason for the month? 2 3 MS. BRADY: Your Honor, she does have a number of 4 things to get in order, her apartment, her finances, and her --5 THE COURT: I have no objection to that. The surrender date will be March 28, on or before 2 p.m. 6 7 Ms. Brady, are you aware of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as I have stated it? 8 9 MS. BRADY: No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Ms. Mermelstein? 11 MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: I hereby order the sentence to be imposed 13 as I have stated it. 14 Is there a limited waiver of appeal rights here? 15 MS. MERMELSTEIN: Your Honor, I believe there is, although I confess I'm not certain. I assume there is. 16 17 MS. BRADY: I think that's right. 18 THE COURT: What do you think is right? Is there a 19 waiver of rights in the plea agreement? 20 MS. BRADY: I believe there is. I don't know if I 21 have it with me either. 22 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to take a look at it. I 23 don't want to give her advice that's inaccurate. I'm going to 24 take a look for it. Normally I don't keep those. 25 MS. BRADY: Your Honor, Ms. Wen says that she did give up the right to appeal.

THE COURT: All right. My records do not have it; they normally don't. I return those to the prosecutors.

Ms. Wen, you have the right to appeal the sentence I just imposed on you. If you cannot pay the cost of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis.

I do wish to inform you -- which you apparently already know -- that in your plea agreement you agreed to waive your right to appeal, and you agreed to waive your right to collaterally attack the sentence I imposed if I impose a sentence that is 21 months or below. And I certainly have done that, because I sentenced you to three months' incarceration.

If you request, the clerk of the court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately. Do you understand your appeal rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The government, I take it there are no open counts?

MS. MERMELSTEIN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Wen, I have sentenced you, as I say, largely because of the concern of general deterrence, that is, that others not do what you did, that others understand that you cannot assist people in illegally obtaining asylum here in the United States. You weren't simply a

translator; you had a larger role. You have a lot of skills, obviously. You have been trained scientifically. You do have skills as a translator. It sounds like you also have managerial and supervisory skills. When you get out of prison, please, make sure you use those skills in legal ways.

You have a great deal to contribute to your community; just do it legally. Make sure I don't see you again.

And I want to address Mr. Wen, Ms. Wen's son, for a moment. Mr. Wen, your mother is not a bad person by any stretch of the imagination. I am sure you understand that. She has scores of letters of all the good things she has done. She did something, however, that's illegal. She did something that was wrong, but she has devoted a great deal of her life to raising you correctly with the right standards and the right values, and it sounds like you are well on the way to becoming a responsible adult. Don't let this change your view of your She is going to need your support over the next six She is out for a couple of months, and she will be in months. for three months. Make sure you give it to her. OK? She is It's important that you stay in school and not a bad person. graduate. Do you understand that?

MR. WEN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

\* \* \*

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23